

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2006

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691.035		10/22/2003	Imran Ulla	MTNC006US0 7552	
58417	7590	08/01/2006		EXAMINER	
HEINZ GR			LEA EDMONDS, LISA S		
5810 TRADE CENTER DR. SUITE 300				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, T	X 78744		2835		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	Office Assistant Commencer	10/691,035	ULLA ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Lisa Lea-Edmonds	2835				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence addre	∍ SS			
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ware to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirg rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 No	ovember 2005					
2a)⊠							
	· <u> </u>						
<u>ا</u> رد	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte quayre, 1000 O.D. 11, 4	30 0.0. 210.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.					
5)🛛	Claim(s) <u>4-6,10-17,20 and 22-26</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠							
7)							
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	•				
Applicat	ion Papers	·					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
	The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2003 is/are:		I to by the Examiner.				
,—	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	-	· ·			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		• •	1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		•	, ,			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 H S C & 119/a)-(d) or (f)	•			
•	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	phoney under 55 5.5.5. § 115(a)-(d) 01 (l).				
u)	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		ion No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•		200			
	application from the International Bureau		ca iii tiiis Mattoriai Ott	190			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ed.				
`	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2						
	•						
Attachmen		·					
	te of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal F		52)			
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6)	•				

Application/Control Number: 10/691,035 Page 2

Art Unit: 2835

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 18, 19, 21, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuang et al. (6700775). With respect to claims 1-3, 9, 18, 19, 21, and 26, Chuang et al. teaches a tablet PC device comprising a portable computer "tablet PC" (1) having a display (12) disposed on a first major surface, and a protective cover (2) adapted to releaseably engage the tablet PC (1) in a first orientation in which it covers the display (12), wherein the cover (2) is further adapted to releasably engage the tablet PC (1) in a second orientation which does not cover the display (12), wherein the cover (2) is removable as claimed (see for example figures 1-8). However, Chuang et al. lacks a teaching of the protective cover having a battery pack disposed therein as claimed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the protective cover (2) of Chuang et al. to include a battery pack disposed therein to provide power to the components (i.e. keyboard (23) and connector (24), which electrically connects to the tablet PC (1)) disposed therein. It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the battery pack to be removable and/or releasable from the cover. Applicant is directed toward the apparatus of Ma (5132876) for such teachings, if applicant disagrees with the examiners

Art Unit: 2835.

statements of obviousness. With respect to claims 7 and 8, it would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide for a plurality of battery pack and/or batteries within a battery pack to provide the user with an extended time of use.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 4-6, 10-17, and 22-25 are allowed.
- 4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: as to claims 4-6, patentability resides, as least in part, in the cover engaging the second major surface of the computer as claimed and in combination with the other limitations of the base claim; as to claims 10-16, patentability resides, as least in part, in the battery pack having an indicator thereon which indicates the degree to which the battery is charged as claimed and in combination with the other limitations of the base claim; as to claim 17, patentability resides, as least in part, in the computer (PC) having internal batteries, wherein the cover is adapted to be connected to an external power source and to thereby recharge the battery pack in the cover as well as the internal batteries in the PC, as claimed and in combination with the other limitations of the base claim; as to claim 20, patentability resides in the tablet PC comprising a chassis, a display, a protective cover having a first and second orientation and also having a battery pack disposed therein, wherein the battery pack is in electrical communication with the internal circuitry of the tablet PC when the cover is in the second orientation as claimed; as to claims 22-26, patentability resides, as least in part, in the cover is adapted to power (provide AC power) a peripheral device, wherein the peripheral is a disk drive,

Art Unit: 2835

wherein the peripheral device is a cell phone as claimed and in combination with the other limitations of the base claim

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 11/09/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, applicant is directed to Solomon et al. (2003/022149) and Armitage et al. (2001/0022719, 6282082). All of which teaches an additional battery or power source in a cover (base) for powering the computer. In view of what is know in the art by example of Solomon et al. and Armitage et al., one of ordinary skill would find a suggestion or motivation to incorporate and additional battery or power source in the cover (base) as claimed. Also, In response to applicant's argument that "it requires a cognitive leap to place batteries in

Application/Control Number: 10/691,035 Page 5

Art Unit: 2835

the cove that are capable of powering the computer", the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Conclusion

- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please note the teachings of Solomon et al. (2003/022149), Armitage et al. (2001/0022719, 6282082) and Ulla et al. (6882524).
- 7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa Lea-Edmonds whose telephone number is 571-272-2043. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Field can be reached on (571) 272-2800, ext 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lisa Lea-Edmonds
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2835

2006-07-27